

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA

<b>John Eddie Daniels,</b>	)	
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	<b>C/A No. 6:04-23294-CMC-WMC</b>
	)	
v.	)	<b>OPINION AND ORDER</b>
	)	
<b>The City of West Columbia; Tony Owens, Captain</b>	)	
<b>for City of West Columbia; Police Department;</b>	)	
<b>Chief of Police; and others to be named through</b>	)	
<b>discovery,</b>	)	
	)	
Defendants.	)	
	)	

---

Plaintiff, proceeding *pro se*, filed this action on December 17, 2004, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983 and, although he does not identify the specific constitutional right allegedly violated by Defendants, it appears that he is claiming he was arrested without probable cause in violation of the Fourth Amendment to the United States Constitution. On August 16, 2005, Defendants filed a motion for summary judgment. Plaintiff was advised by court order of the summary judgment procedure and possible consequences if he failed to respond adequately to the motion. Plaintiff filed a response on July 13, 2005.

In accordance with this court's order of reference, 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Rule 73.02(B)(2)(d), this matter was referred to United States Magistrate Judge William M. Catoe for a Report and Recommendation.

This court is charged with making a *de novo* determination of any portion of the Report and Recommendation of the Magistrate Judge to which a specific objection is made. The court may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendation made by the Magistrate Judge or recommit the matter to the Magistrate Judge with instructions. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 636(b). The court reviews only for clear error in the absence of an objection. *See Diamond v. Colonial Life & Accident Ins. Co.*, 416 F.3d 310, 315 (4th Cir. 2005) (stating that “in the absence of a timely filed objection, a district court need not conduct a *de novo* review, but instead must ‘only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face

of the record in order to accept the recommendation.'") (quoting Fed. R. Civ. P. 72 advisory committee's note).

Based on his review of the record, the Magistrate Judge has recommended that Defendants' motion for summary judgment be granted. The Magistrate Judge advised Plaintiff of the procedures and requirements for filing objections to the Report and Recommendation and the serious consequences if he failed to do so. Plaintiff has filed no objections and the time for doing so has expired.

After reviewing the Complaint, the motion and response, and the Report and Recommendation of the Magistrate Judge, the court finds no clear error. Accordingly, the Report and Recommendation of the Magistrate Judge is adopted and incorporated by reference.

**IT IS HEREBY ORDERED** that Defendants' motion for summary judgment is **GRANTED** and this action is *dismissed with prejudice*.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

s/ Cameron McGowan Currie

CAMERON MCGOWAN CURRIE  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Columbia, South Carolina  
January 25, 2006

C:\Documents and Settings\guest\Local Settings\Temp\notesFFF692\04-23294 Daniels v. City of W. Columbia - sj granted and case dism w prej - no objs.wpd